Author Sully, Nicole

Title 'Celebration, subterfuge and exclusion: the Potemkin Village and its legacy'

Date 2005

Source *Celebration: proceedings of the 22nd annual conference of the Society of Architectural Historians, Australia and New Zealand*, pp. 353-8.

ISBN 0473103494; 9780473103491

Celebration, Subterfuge and Exclusion

The Potemkin village and its legacy

Nicole Sully
The University of Western Australia

Human rights activists have long expressed outrage at reports of Brazilian 'death squads' and extrajudicial killings as a means of 'cleansing' the streets of the homeless and other so-called undesirable citizens. Techniques for the elimination of visible signs of poverty and the presence of socially excluded minorities have also often been a concern at times of major social events or celebrations. During the Atlanta Olympics (1996) the homeless were offered bus tickets to leave the city and attempts were made to introduce legislation which effectively criminalised their plight. Coinciding with the preparations for the Sydney Olympics there were fears that attempts to find temporary accommodation for the homeless during the games period were motivated less by humanitarian concerns than endeavours to 'sanitise' the streets and mask the signs of the city's social problems. Endeavours to conceal social realities, such as those practiced by the Brazilians, or the less extreme measures of Olympic host cities, have generated a number of interesting issues with regard to not only exclusion but artifice and illusion. Issues which were also present in 2003 when the APEC summit in Bangkok saw beautification efforts extend beyond the placement of potted plants and the removal of dogs and beggars. The Thai government erected large banners to hide views of the slums from visiting delegates, a tactic which was alarmingly reminiscent of the actions of Grigory Potemkin. Coinciding with Catherine the Great's tour of the Crimea in the eighteenth century, legend has it that Potemkin staged the construction of elaborate fake villages along the shores of the Dnieper River, to give the impression of prosperity among its citizens—concealing social realities with cardboard constructed illusions. This paper will discuss the Potemkin Village and its legacy, with reference to the Bangkok banners.

In 1855, the Englishman, Reverend Thomas Milner, wrote of the nature, impressions and vision of the Crimean landscape encountered by Catherine the Great, during her celebratory tour of the region in 1787—her jubilee year. Without having actually been one of the party, Milner's account conveyed 'firsthand' impressions of the visit—poetic and sensory, factual and surmised. He wrote:

> *The sky was bright, the air calm, and the shores verdant: and as the fleet sailed along, the spectacles prepared by the prolific genius of Potemkin were visible on either hand, though not in their true character. At greater or less distant intervals pretty insulated dwellings were seen, so disposed with respect to the soils as to form picturesque points of view. Well built villages appeared, the extent of which would lead the beholder to expect a numerous population, while their exterior aspect seemed to bespeak the comfort of the inhabitants. There were groups of men, women, and children, flocks of sheep and droves of cattle, shepherds and herdsmen.*[1]

Milner's description of this bucolic vision was soon interrupted by a series of rather sinister allegations, of the most profound subterfuge. Abruptly dissolving the idyllic vision, he wrote that the houses were in fact, "slender fronts hastily run up—the villages collections of them." Without explaining if motivated by an eye for economy, ingenuity or simply indolence, Milner stated that:

> *Peasantry, flocks and herds, had been brought from various parts of the empire; and were successfully removed from one spot to another, often under the cover of the night, so that a few thousand sufficed to produce the spectacle of a country teeming with people.*[2]

While begrudgingly acknowledging there to be "much doubtless that was real connected with the artificial", Milner tells that these villages were in fact an elaborate illusion constructed by Prince Grigori Potemkin to deceive the Empress. Potemkin's portable facades were not simply those history has claimed were picturesquely assembled from cardboard on the shores of the Dneiper River—rather he was credited with constructing an elaborate social façade, designed to mask social realities

and to fabricate a new and more flattering representation of the 'truth'. Potemkin's social mask was designed to give the impression of an idyllic and advanced settlement of Russia's newly acquired territory. He aimed to deceive the Empress into believing his progress was more substantial than it was and distracting her from the realisation that he had squandered both his time and her money.[3]

Making reference to the account of what has become known proverbially as the 'Potemkin villages' Thomas Seifrid in 2001 wrote, "Any one who deals with Russian culture must at some point be struck by the attraction it exhibits to such phenomena as illusion, masks and various types of sham."[4] Continuing, he argues that Russian history and culture can be less interpreted as a palimpsestic model, such as that by which we often regard cultural history, asserting instead that it can best be characterised by the idea of the *mask*. Seifrid argues that Russian culture, as he states, is: "distinguished by a set of practices that work toward producing a sign or façade of something in anticipation of obtaining its referent, only to stop there." He suggests that as historically such activity has often been 'state sponsored' it has subsequently been linked "with the working out of national identity."[5]

Emerging from the account of the Potemkin villages, this paper argues that the mask that Seifrid argues is an inherent part of Russian identity is a commonly invoked tool identified with cities and celebrations. This paper will, firstly, discuss the historical circumstances surrounding Potemkin's famous villages, and secondly, detail a number of examples which represent their architectural and social legacy in contemporary culture.

Catherine the Great and Potemkin

In 1787, Prince Shcherbatov—one of Catherine the Great's prominent detractors— encapsulated his thoughts of the Empress, by describing the manner in which she rose to the throne:

> *A woman not born of the blood of our sovereigns, who deposed her husband by an armed insurrection, she received, in return for so virtuous a deed the crown and sceptre of Russia, together with the title of 'Devout Sovereign'.*[6]

Despite receiving widespread support from the Russian public, given the nature of her tumultuous accession to the throne it was inevitable that she would accumulate vocal enemies of her reign. Continuing with his criticisms, Shcherbatov conceded, "It cannot be said that she is unqualified to rule so great an Empire, if indeed a woman can support this yoke," before proceeding to catalogue in elaborate detail what he perceived as her many faults.[7] Among these he included that she: "trusts herself entirely to her favourites; she is full of ostentation, and incapable of forcing herself to attend to any matters which may bore her." He added, "she takes everything on herself and takes no care to see it carried out, and finally she is so capricious she rarely keeps the same system of government even for a month."[8]

Despite this capriciousness, Catherine's term in power saw substantial expansion *to* and *within* the Russian Empire. Perhaps most notably was the annexation of the Crimea, undertaken primarily as a measure to control Russia's vulnerable borders, also enabling easy passage to the Black Sea—and subsequently offering new opportunities for exploration and trade. It was marketed by her supporters as the 'Paradise that Russia needed', although even after its conquest, accounts of its true nature were mixed.[9] The annexation of the Crimea was the catalyst for a vast programme of planning and construction overseen and initiated largely by Griygori Potemkin—the most renown of Catherine the Great's famed 'favourites' (and some historical sources speculate, her secret husband). Undoubtedly regarded as an example of her over-trusted favourites, it was under the climate created by the likes of Shcherbatov that emerged the extraordinary criticisms of Potemkin and his achievements. His work was subjected to constant criticism from detractors eager to debunk his status within the state while also serving to undermine Catherine's power.

Thomas Milner, for example, wrote that Potemkin, "squandered millions, resorted to the meanest artifices to extort trifling sums of money, haggled with his creditors, duped them when he could, and swindled the imperial treasury. Such was Potemkin: clever, bold, fertile, false, and thoroughly unprincipled."[10] Similarly, the vast planning and construction works initiated by Potemkin in the south were recast as folly by the Comte de Damas, who wrote:

> *He would move a guberniya [province], demolish a town with a view to building it somewhere else, form a new colony or a new industrial centre, and change the administration of a province, all in a spare half hour before giving his whole attention to the arrangement of a ball or a fête.*[11]

The Comte de Damas', and later Milner's, accounts of Potemkin were just two of many vocal reports (others for example held him responsible for the spread of the plague in the region). In reality Potemkin's achievements *were* considerable; he founded Odessa, Simferopol and Kherson—an important Black Sea port. He also initiated the design and construction of the proposed capital to this new part of the Russian empire, conceived as a southern St. Petersburg, and aptly named Yekaterinoslav (meaning Catherine's glory). Characterised by his usual sycophantic penmanship, in a letter to Catherine requesting funding for this venture, Potemkin wrote of his determination to create a 'celebrated city', stating:

> *Your most Gracious Majesty... I have undertaken to compile plans worthy of this city's lofty name... I envision there a magnificent temple, an imitation*

> *of St. Paul's outside Rome, dedicated to the lord's Transfiguration as a sign that your labours have transfigured this land from a barren steppe into an abundant garden, and the dwelling-place of the beasts into a favourable refuge for people arriving from all countries.*[12]

Potemkin further outlined a series of civic and industrial ventures influenced by classical societies. Within a week he wrote again telling of the progress he had made towards the establishing of agriculture and industry in the region. Given this brisk change of tone from outlining his utopian plans to cataloguing his success it is not difficult to see why his detractors doubted the reports of his progress. Potemkin's greatest architectural legacy however has not remained with the buildings he commissioned or the cities that were created or blossomed under his influence. Instead it remains with the legend of the 'Potemkin Village'.

Journey to the Crimea

In November of 1787 Catherine the Great undertook an epic tour from St Petersburg to the Crimea, in order to inspect the progress of her newly annexed territory and to be crowned Queen of Taurida. Undertaken in her jubilee year, the journey was both self-congratulatory and promotional. The travelling entourage included a host of diplomats included with the intention that they would disseminate the accounts of what they saw, and subsequently tell the world of the state and success of the new territory.[13] However the stories that emerged about this journey could hardly be what Catherine had anticipated.

Reports of the scale and extravagance of this tour are still somewhat shocking in modern times. Writing in 1966, Mary Durant stated:

> *Catherine's gold-plated tour lasted six months, entertained three thousand guests, covered more than a thousand miles, and cost seven million rubles, or roughly eighteen million dollars in present day terms.*[14]

Planned over the course of four years, Catherine's tour of the Crimea was the catalyst for a building programme of similar scale and proportion to that which might now be undertaken by a city hosting the Olympic Games. The journey down the Dneiper left a trail which represented a fascinating interplay between permanent and impermanent traces. In addition to the specially constructed vehicles in which she travelled, gardens were planted in celebration of her and a series of houses and palaces were constructed or renovated at strategic intervals along their trail to accommodate the party.[15]

The journey was undertaken by both land and water. Departing in winter, they travelled from Saint Petersburg to Kiev where they remained until they would be able to travel by water in May. This part of the journey was undertaken in a purpose-built vehicle, with an entourage of fourteen sleighs.[16] The journey down the Dnieper River was undertaken by a convoy of some eighty ships. The river journey enabled the path to be predetermined by Potemkin, thus allowing him to display what he wished her to see. Vincent Cronin, in 1978, wrote: "At each stop Catherine went ashore and questioned landowners... and others about their work, aspirations and needs. She took careful note of injustices and abuses."[17] At every stage of her journey, Catherine was greeted with flattery and indulgence. Obviously pleased with Potemkin's progress and the attentions bestowed, her praise was warm. It was in reaction to this praise that public accounts emerged that Potemkin's efforts were nothing more than an elaborate sham—in a series of accounts such as that of Milner's outlined in the introduction.

Milner wrote that the tour was suggested by one of Potemkin's detractors in the hope of exposing his fraudulence. It was however Georges von Helbig who first publicly alleged that the settlements flanking the Dneiper River were painted cardboard screens.[18] Von Helbig's account was designed as much to mock the Empress' judgement as it was to defame Potemkin. A certain amount of plausibility was lent to the accounts through reports of the expense and extremes that Potemkin had legitimately gone to accommodate the Empress and to commemorate her visit. The Empress experienced an unfathomable degree of luxury—and vast sums of money were spent in preparation for and in facilitating this extraordinary tour. Furthermore, such accounts were provided with historical authenticity by the other narratives that emerged from and about the Crimean journey. By most accounts, many of Potemkin's strategies for development and improvement in the region were preoccupied with the portrayal of the *appearance* of prosperity.

Potemkin's villages

The supposed mock villages were tantamount to a veneer of cultural wealth and prosperity applied to the banks of the Dneiper River. The accounts of the 'Potemkin Villages' emerged for a number of reasons, firstly, they were in fact raised a number of years prior to Catherine's journey. In fact speculation began in the 1770s that Potemkin had yet to achieve anything in the Crimea.[19] This speculation apparently escalated to the accusation of duplicity with the invention of the cardboard villages story, when it was shown that he had made headway.[20] It was Georg von Helbig who was seemingly responsible for not only the invention of the account, but for the eventual infiltration of this term into language, being used to convey the idea of a sham.[21] Later, upon return from Kherson (Potemkin's first city), visitors expressed surprise that the cities did in fact exist.[22] The claims of the fake villages again resurfaced following Catherine's visit to the Crimea, in a response to the reluctance to give credit to Potemkin's achievements and as subversive explanation of the

reports of his success.
The anonymously authored *Memoir of the life of Prince Potemkin* defended against the many attacks against Potemkin's achievements, writing: "Attempts have been made to ridicule the first foundations of towns and colonies... Time has justified our observations. Listen to the travellers who have seen Kherson and Odessa"[23] However, the accounts of Potemkin's subterfuge were escalated to such a degree, some theorists have suggested that Catherine's tour was largely motivated by a desire to determine whether there was indeed any truth to these stories.[24]

Potemkin's legacy

The account of Potemkin's villages is more fascinating than simply the allusion to fakery, the artificial façade or mask—it has become something of a *precedent*. The metaphor of the mask which Seifrid argued was an integral component in Russian cultural identity has been exploited in recent years through the adoption of means which are in many ways akin to the account of Potemkin's cardboard villages.

Although it is generally accepted that accounts of the Potemkin Villages were themselves the substance of fiction rather than truth, these maintain a very real legacy, and one that, like the original, is linked to celebration. These tactics can generally be categorised as either acts of *cleansing*—being the removal or transportation of an 'element'—or *masking*—being the construction of a façade or veneer to conceal social realities.

The village inverted

While Potemkin supposedly transported itinerant peasants to accompany his cardboard villages, waving patriotically before them as the Empress sailed past, in more recent years endeavours to sanitise the presentation of a city have pursued the opposite strategy. Rather than transport in ideal residents, the most controversial efforts of recent times have instead addressed ways of managing the existing inhabitants. Such strategies have been undertaken in various scales, and with varying social and philosophical implications.

To begin with easily the most extreme example, human rights activists have long expressed outrage at reports of Brazilian 'death squads' and extrajudicial killings as a means of 'cleansing' the streets of the homeless and other so-called undesirable citizens. While reports of these community-sponsored executions (undertaken by the police) are reportedly a practice that is *geographically* rather than *temporally* motivated, techniques for the elimination of visible signs of poverty and the presence of socially excluded minorities have often been a concern at times of major social events or celebrations, in particular the Olympic Games. Concerns have repeatedly been raised about the way Olympic host cities address the delicate balance between presenting their city in a positive light and the suppression of social problems—and subsequently the exclusion of certain 'types' of people. While hardly as horrifying of the fate of the homeless in somewhere such as Brazil, coinciding with the Atlanta Olympics (1996), attempts were made to introduce legislation which effectively criminalised the plight of the homeless.[25] Upon the expression of community concern, later (as a kind of compromise) they were issued with bus tickets to transport them out of town, beyond the watchful eyes of the world.[26] In Atlanta, there was not the construction of a 'lie' or the application of a mask, rather through this act of social cleansing, the city was represented as a half-told truth.

The Olympic Games have continually been plagued with associations of cultural cleansing and the masking of visible signs of poverty. During the preparations for the Sydney Olympics, human rights activists again expressed concern about fears that the event would place too much pressure on low cost accommodation, and would subsequently see the homeless and impoverished (those least able to adjust to the increased accommodation demand) severely disadvantaged. Plans to relocate the homeless into disused hospitals more than 200 kilometres away, for the period of the Games, were condemned as being generated less by concern for the welfare of the homeless and more by the desire to present Sydney as a city without the social stigma of poverty. A position which was not alleviated by the outrageous comments of Sydney's Lord Mayor at the time. Councillor Frank Sartor, apparently endeavouring to alleviate public concerns, stated "No-one will be forced to move" then, proceeded to defend this relocation scheme by presenting the negative consequence of tactics to induce the homeless to relocate. Sartor, stated:

> *You could shine lights on them to make life uncomfortable, but they will only move to another hole somewhere else. There has to be a solution. We cannot afford to be a world city, with fantastic fireworks and the Olympics without also showing that we are dealing with our problems of the homeless on the streets.*[27]

Similar acts of cleansing to those conceived for Sydney and Atlanta also emerged in relation to other unwanted inhabitants of the city during preparations for the Athens Olympics (2004), and outrage was expressed in reaction to official plans to capture, vaccinate, sterilise then re-release stray dogs.[28] Interestingly while these acts were all tantamount to social cleansing, acts of masking social problems have taken on literal and architectural incarnations in a number of recent examples.

Potemkin's banners

In 2002, as part of the preparations for the International Conference on Financing for Development in Monterrey, (an event sponsored by the United Nations) a wall was erected to conceal a slum in the Mexican city, an act

of construction which was fundamentally at odds with the nature of the event itself.[29] Paradoxically, part of the agenda of this meeting was to table strategies to eliminate half the world's poverty by the year 2015.[30] However, this act of construction and exclusion prefigured an act which took place the following year which perhaps presents the greatest realisation of a Potemkin Village.

In 2003 the Thai government's efforts to visibly sanitise Bangkok in preparation for the international delegates attending the APEC summit were alarming reminiscent of the actions Potemkin's contemporaries accused him of. The tactics of the Thai government involved a two-fold attack on the city, acts of both *cleansing* and *masking*. Like Potemkin, the government sought to eliminate visual reminders of poverty—beggars and more than 3000 stray dogs were removed from the streets. Newspapers reported that among the 10,000 homeless reportedly removed from the vicinity the Thai Air force transported almost one thousand Cambodian beggars 'home' to Phnom Penh.[31] The Governor, apparently justifying such measures, described the homeless as "a nuisance and should be treated like stray dogs".[32] The townscape was adorned with potted plants and shop fronts were repainted, in part of a programme of gentrification that amounted to the cost of more than $20 million dollars.[33] However perhaps most fascinating, and disturbing, were the interventions made on the Chao Phraya River.

Part of a series of festivities planned to coincide with the APEC Summit was a parade of historic Royal Barges down the river. Large banners (another of Governor Samak Sunda-Ravej's initiatives) were erected along the banks of the river to conceal from view the Tha Tien slum which houses the city's poorest inhabitants. The banners, more than four storeys high and spanning more than 360 metres in length, reportedly attracted the attention of the Guinness Book of Records, which subsequently—and rather sadly—listed it as the world's largest banner.[34] The newspapers of the time reported that the houseproud slum dwellers were pleased that their circumstances were being concealed from visiting delegates—saving them from the embarrassment of pity, while other newspapers depicted images of Buddhist monks before these banners bowing their heads—unable to comprehend the horrors of a society that would choose to spend such considerable sums of public funds concealing the city's social problems rather than endeavouring to solve them. In a final chilling coincidence, inadvertently following in the footsteps of Potemkin's cardboard villages, these large banners depicted historic scenes of the city and in particular, a depiction of Bangkok's Grand Palace Temple—a building in front of which the visiting delegates posed for photographers. Ironically, condemning the scheme, Senator Chrmsak Pinthong predicted "Things like this may attract criticism from foreign media."[35]

Interestingly while the media attention bestowed upon the Bangkok banners in many ways undermined the veneer, the visiting delegates seemingly turned a good mannered 'blind eye' to what the rest of the world regarded as a horrifying humanitarian spectacle. In the absence of political contempt at the social implications of the concealment of poverty behind by a strategically placed curtain it was left to the photographs of monks to convey the sadness of it all.

It is generally conceded that the accounts of the Potemkin villages were merely malicious rumours invented by his adversaries, calculated to undermine his achievements and growing power. Yet this idea of the constructed façade as a means of conveying a false impression has a strong architectural legacy, beyond the actions of social concealment in practice in Mexico and Thailand, and one that could be explored beyond this paper. Arguably Potemkin's legacy extends with equal plausibility to the domain of heritage, for example, the preservation of streetscapes and their aesthetics through the enforced retention of facades could arguably be construed as a kind of inverse Potemkin Village. However, arguably, nowhere is this analogy more appropriate than in the New Urbanist town of Celebration in Florida. Here attempts to mask social realities, and create a fiction of belonging among its residents has been invoked through architectural aesthetics (the employment of pre-1940s style architecture), and architectural detail more concerned with conveying the illusion of a set of ideals than achieving them.[36]

NOTES

1 Thomas Milner, *The Crimea, its ancient and modern history: the Khans, the Sultans, and the Czars*, London: Longman, Brown, Green, and Longmans, 1855, pp. 255-256.

2 Milner, *Crimea, its ancient and modern history*, p. 256.

3 Milner, *Crimea, its ancient and modern history*, p. 256-257.

4 Thomas Seifrid, '"Illusion" and Its Workings in Modern Russian Culture', *Slavic and East European Journal*, 45, 2 (2001), p. 205.

5 Seifrid, '"Illusion and Its Workings in Modern Russian Culture', p. 205.

6 M. M. Shcherbatov, *On the Corruption of Morals in Russia*, trans. A. Lentin, London: Cambridge University Press, 1969, reproduced in L. Jay Oliva (ed.) *Catherine the Great*, Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall, 1971, p. 101.

7 Shcherbatov, *Corruption of Morals in Russia*, p. 101.

8 Shcherbatov, *Corruption of Morals in Russia*, p. 102.

9 Letter from Potemkin to Catherine the Great, before 14 December 1782, reproduced in David Smith (ed.), *Love and Conquest: Personal Correspondence of Catherine the Great and Prince Grigory Potemkin*, trans. David Smith, DeKalb, Ill.: Northern Illinois University Press, 2004, letter 259, p. 124.

10 Milner, *Crimea, its ancient and modern history*, p. 232.

11 Comte de Damas, cited in Simon Sebag Montefiore, *Potemkin: Catherine the Great's Imperial Partner*, New York: Vintage Books, 2005, p. 263.

12 Letter from Potemkin to Catherine, 06.10.1786, in Smith, *Love and Conquest*, letter no. 287, p. 163.

13 Mary Durant, 'Catherine's Boat Ride', *Horizon*, 8, 4 (1966), p. 101.

14 Durant, 'Catherine's Boat Ride', p. 98.

15 Durant, 'Catherine's Boat Ride', p. 100. Durant also notes: "each house was supplied with new linen and plate... used but once to serve the Empress, they then became the property of household that entertained her."

16 The Empress' vehicle reportedly required thirty horses to pull it, contained a drawing room, an orchestra, a library and bedroom.— Durant, p. 100.

17 Vincent Cronin, *Catherine: empress of all Russians*, Collins: London, 1978, p. 250.

18 Montefiore, *Potemkin*, p. 380.

19 Montefiore, *Potemkin*, p. 380.

20 Montefiore, *Potemkin*, p. 380.

21 Montefiore, *Potemkin*, p. 380. Montefiore notes Helbig published this account on a number of occasions, suggesting these accounts "laid the foundation of a historical version of Potemkin that was as fabricated and unjust as he claimed his villages to be."

22 Montefiore, *Potemkin*, p. 380.

23 Anon., *The Memoirs of the Life of Prince Potemkin, comprehending original anecdotes of Catherine II and of the Russian court*, London, 1812, pp. 66-67, cited in Montefiore, *Potemkin*, p. 263.

24 Montefiore, *Potemkin*, p. 380.

25 Shawn Foster, 'Atlanta's Olympic Legacy: More Poverty, Less Freedom', *Salt Lake City Tribune*, 26 March 1999.

26 Foster, 'Atlanta's Olympic Legacy', Foster cited Gerald Weber the legal director if the American Civil Liberties Union of Georgia who stated: "Before the Olympics, the city of Atlanta passed six ordinances that essentially made it a crime to be homeless.... The city even offered free bus tickets to the homeless to leave the city." Foster observes that while these ordinances were eventually overturned, 10,000 homeless people were detained prior to this.

27 Frank Walker, 'Swept under the Carpet', *Sun Herald*, 16 January 2000.

28 'Stray Dogs "Killed to Clean up City"', originally published in *Miami Herald*, http://www.cleansafeworldwide.org/doc.asp?doc+809&cat=130, accessed 2 April 2005. This article also cites the instance of the discovery of dozens of stray cats and dogs in Athens' National Garden, and the suspicion that these animals had been poisoned as part of an official clean-up of the city in preparation of Athens tenure as head of the European Union.

29 Michael Reed, 'Opinion: Walls hiding Monterrey slums undermine UN conference goals', published online 4 March 2002, http://www.statepress.com/issues/2002/03/04/opinions/195821, accessed 2 April 2005.

30 Reed, 'Opinion: Walls Hiding Monterrey Slums Undermine UN Conference Goals'.

31 Mark Baker, 'Bangkok tries to polish its image to impress visiting leaders', *Sydney Morning Herald*, 18 October 2003.

32 Baker, 'Bangkok tries to polish its image to impress visiting leaders'.

33 Baker, 'Bangkok tries to polish its image to impress visiting leaders'.

34 Napanisa Kaewmorakot, 'Giant Banner unfurled to hide slum', *Bangkok's Independent Newspaper*, 17 October 2003.

35 Kaewmorakot, 'Giant Banner unfurled to hide slum'.

36 For further elaboration on these ideas see Sully, 'An Everyday Nostalgia: Memory and the fictions of belonging', *Everyday Transformations: The twenty-first century quotidian, Annual conference of the Cultural Studies Association of Australasia* [Online Proceedings], Perth: 2004.